

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which replaces the original sheet of drawings includes Fig. 1. The changes include the revision to include another layer (barrier layer 109) to prevent contamination disposed over the substrate 101.

Enclosure: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-22 are presently pending in the filed application.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification as failing to provide antecedent basis for features of claims 1 and 14. Notably, the filed application describes (at paragraph 00180) "The substrate itself may also be barrier to contaminants such as water vapor, or oxygen, or both, and prevents contaminants from reaching a layer 102 that includes the OLEDs. Alternatively, **another layer(s) to prevent contamination may be disposed over the substrate 101.**" (Emphasis added.) In an embodiment, layer 107 is disposed over (and beneath) the substrate. Of course, this does not preclude the locating a barrier layer over the substrate on the opposing side. Thereby, a barrier layer may be disposed over the substrate and between the substrate and the OLED material or light emitting material.

Accordingly, from the filed application it is plain that the barrier layer may be: 1.) over the substrate 101; and/or 2.) between the substrate 101 and the OLED 102 or light emitting layer. The amendment to the specification and the drawings included with the present amendment is provided to ensure clarity of these points. Because the disclosure as filed includes a basis for the amendments to the specification and drawings, the amendments do not include any new matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under the noted statutes of the Code. The rejections are based solely or partly on the reference to Duggan, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,891,330). Applicants include a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 131 made by Michael X. Ouyang; and supporting pages of a lab notebook maintained by Mr. Ouyang. The Declaration is believed to disqualify the reference to

Duggan, et al. rendering all rejections moot.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0238 for any additional fees, including, but not limited to, the fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17.

Respectfully Submitted

on behalf of:

Corning Incorporated

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. S. Francos', written over a horizontal line.

by: William S. Francos, Esq.

(Reg. No. 38,456)

January 30, 2006
Volentine, Francos & Whitt, PLLC
Two Meridian Boulevard
Wyomissing, PA 19610
(610) 375-3513 (v)
(610) 375-8380 (f)

Enclosure: One (1) Replacement Sheet of Drawings
Declaration
Copy of Lab Notebook Pages 53-59